

Appl: 10/079,605
Docket: BRONNE00402
Reply to Office Action dated: January 18, 2005
Response filed July 18, 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes re-labeling of the first Fig. 7B (as in the formal drawings as filed on November 27, 2002) to Fig 7A. Applicant notes that the drawings as originally filed indicate the proper labeling of the figures.

Attachment includes a Replacement Sheet for sheet 7 (out of 9).

REMARKS

Claims 3-8 are amended as shown above to correct a typographical error with the claim dependency. Claims 30 and 31 are cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1, and 3-29 are currently pending.

Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes re-labeling of the first Fig. 7B (as in the formal drawings as filed on November 27, 2002) to Fig 7A. Applicant notes that the drawings as originally filed indicate the proper labeling of the figures.

35 USC §102:

The office action rejected claim 31 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Colley et al. (US 4,319,580). Applicant disagrees and cancels the claim to expedite allowance of the subject application. However, Applicant wishes to respectfully bring the following issue to the Examiner's attention:

In the previous Office mailed June 9, 2004, claim 31 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colley et al. (US 4,319,580) in view of Webster, Jr. (US 5,916,158). Applicant believes that the nature of this rejection acknowledges that Colley fails to teach all of the elements of claim 31 and further acknowledges that the rejection requires Webster for additional support.

In the response to the June 9, 2004 Office Action, applicant added the word "matched" to claim 31, resulting in "an acoustically matched transmitting material distal to said ultrasonic transducer; and acoustically transmitting material."

Now, the Office Action's rejection proposes that claim 31 is fully anticipated by Colley. Applicant is unclear as to why the previous amendment to claim 31 gives rise to a rejection under 35 USC §102 rather than the original 35 USC §103 rejection.

In any case, applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claim 31 in a continuing application.

Appl: 10/079,605
Docket: BRONNE00402
Reply to Office Action dated: January 18, 2005
Response filed July 18, 2005

35 USC §103:

The office action rejected claim 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colley et al. (US 4,319,580) in view of Webster, Jr. (US 5,916,158).

Applicant disagrees with the rejection of the above claims. However, to expedite the prosecution of the case, applicant cancelled claim 30.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claim 30 in a continuing application.

Summary

Applicant wishes to express gratitude to the Examiner for the indication that claims 1 and 3-29 are allowable upon the correction of the claim dependency of claims 3-8. Applicant respectfully request rejoining of claims 7-10, 12, and 22-26 which were previously withdrawn and now each ultimately depend from an allowable claim.

Applicant believes all outstanding issue raised in the previous Office Action are addressed herein and that all claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, a telephone call to the undersigned at (650) 242-4212 will be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanjay S. Bagade
Reg. No. 42,280

Attachment:

- 1) Drawing Replacement Sheet